



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,738	01/20/2000	Todd Anthony Mitchell	RO999-164	4844

7590

03/26/2004

Owen J Gamon
IBM Coporation Dept 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/488,738

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL ET AL.

Examiner

Baoquoc N To

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. After carefully review arguments, the Office withdraws the Finality of the Office Action dated on 08/20/00. The Office regrets to cause any inconveniences due to the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under: 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al. (US 5765140) in view of Nakaoka (US. Patent No. 6,092,048).

Re claims 1 and 8, Knudson discloses interactively defining a plurality of groups of users associated with the project, (Col. 2, lines 41-55); Knudson discloses associating a first user with said first group of users, (Col. 2, lines 41 -45 and see abstract); presenting said first project tracking interface having said first set of task selections to said first user; associating a second user with said second group of users, (Col. 4, lines 47-67); Knudson disclose associating a second user with said second group of users, (Col. 2, lines 41-45 and see abstract); presenting said second project tracking interface having said second set of task selections to said second user, (Col. 5, lines 53-58).

Knudson does not clearly teach interactively defining, for each of said plurality of groups of users, a respective project tracking interface, each project tracking interface having a respective set

Art Unit: 2172

of task selection, each task selection of a set of task selections corresponding to a respective task action performed by said at least one computer system, wherein a first set of task selections of a first project tracking interface for a first group of user is different from a second set of task selections of a second project tracking interface for a second group of users. However, Knudson teaches, "the employee and contractors define a resource personnel pool from which the managers assign one or more tasks to selected individuals from the various projects which must be completed in accordance with respective time schedule" (col. 2, lines 48-52). This suggests the project tracking wherein the tasks are assigned to the groups of users to complete upon the time schedule. On the other hand, Nakaoka teaches "a task entry memory unit 1310 is to memorize task entry information indicative of a task in response to the task which is a framework made in order to attain a certain object by the action of one or more plurality of users" (col. 7, lines 43-47). This teaches the object is the task which accessed by the multiple users (group of users). In addition, Nakaoka also teaches "an information display unit 1510 in the task information display/operation unit 1030 provides a user interface which enables task information to be displayed and operated, and includes the following elements: the information display unit 1510 includes a task list display section 1520 for displaying registered tasks in the form of a list and which provides a user interface of an operation concerning a task entry, a task property display section 1530 for providing a user interface of the operation concerning a task property and a task action display section 1540 for displaying a task action of a selected task and which provides a user interface of the operation concerning a task property" (col. 8, lines 51-62). This suggests the each task having difference interface for the user to performing tasks. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Re claims 2 and 9, Knudson further discloses, wherein said step of interactively defining, for each of said plurality of groups of users, a respective project tracking interface, comprises interactively defining, for each task selection, a respective task description, whereby a task selection

Art Unit: 2172

for a first project tracking interface may have a first task description, and the same task selection for a second project tracking interface may have a second task description different from said first task description (col. 2, lines 41-63).

Re claims 3 and 10, Knudson further discloses wherein each task selection displayed in a project tracking interface includes a task status indicator (col. 2, lines 56-63).

Re claims 4 and 11, Knudson further discloses, wherein said task status indicator is assumes one of a plurality of colors, each color corresponding to a respective status (col. 2, lines 56-63).

Re claims 5 and 12, Knudson further discloses, wherein said step of interactively defining, for each of said plurality of groups of users, a respective project tracking interface, comprises generating, for each of said plurality of groups of users, a respective interface definition file, said interface definition files containing entries corresponding to tasks, wherein a first interface definition file for defining said first project tracking interface contains a respective entry for each task selection in said first set of task selections, and a second interface definition file for defining said second project tracking interface contains a respective entry for each task selection in said second set of task selections (col. 2, lines 42-55 and col. 2, lines 41-63).

Re claims 6 and 13, Knudson further discloses, wherein each said entry in an interface definition file includes a respective task description field, whereby a task selection for said first project tracking interface may have a first task description, and the same task selection for said second project tracking interface may have a second task description different from said first task description (col. 2, lines 41-63).

Re claims 7 and 14, Knudson further discloses, wherein each said entry in an interface definition file includes a respective scope field specifying the scope of the task selection, whereby a task selection for said first project tracking interface may have a first scope, and the same task selection for said second project tracking interface may have a second scope different from said first

Art Unit: 2172

scope (col. 2, lines 41-63).

Re claim 15, the subject matter of claim 15 are rejected in the analyzed above in claim 1; therefore, claim 15 is also rejected for the same reasons as given in claim 1.

Re claim 16, Knudson further discloses: an interactive interface definition function, said interactive interface definition function interactively receiving and storing a plurality of said project tracking interface definitions, each project tracking interface definition being associated with a respective group of user of said plurality of user (col. 2, lines 41-63).

Re claim 17, Nakaoka further discloses, wherein each said project tracking interface includes a chronological ordering relationship among task selections of its respective set of task selections and at least one indicator indicating a next expected task selection in said chronological ordering relationship among task selections (col. 8, lines 51-65).

Re claim 18, Nakaoka further discloses, wherein each said project tracking interface includes a chronological ordering relationship among task selections of its respective set of task selections and at least one indicator indicating a next expected task selection in said chronological ordering relationship among task selections, (col. 8, lines 51-65).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is (703) 305-1949 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at (703) 305-9790.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2172

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202
Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Baoquoc N. To
March 20, 2004



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER